

REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 27, and 34-38 have been amended without further limiting the scope thereof. Claims 1-2 and 4-5 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Claims 27 and 34 were placed in an independent format. Claims 35-38 were amended to remain corresponding with independent claim 34. The Abstract has been shortened to less than 150 words. No new matter has been added. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Objections

Claims 27, 29-30, and 34-38 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated allowable if written in an independent form. Claims 27 and 34 were written in an independent form, as requested by the Office. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 27, 29-30, and 34-38 are now allowed.

The Rejections

Claims 1-26, 28, 31-33, and 39-43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Wagner (US 5,742,845) in view of Zeanah (US 5,933,816). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections on the grounds that Applicants' claims recite features, relationships, and steps which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the applied art, and because there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation cited so as to produce the recited invention.

**The Pending Claims Are Not Obvious Over
Wagner in view of Zeanah**

Claim 1

Neither of the references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the recited features and relationships of claim 1. The Action (on page 3) admits that Wagner does not teach or suggest a second icon that corresponds to a second ATM object. However, Wagner does not teach or suggest more features and relationships than the Action admits. For example, where does Wagner even mention “programming?” It follows that Wagner cannot be a primary basis for a “method of programming.”

Zeanah cannot alleviate the admitted deficiencies in Wagner. Nor does the Action explain how Wagner could have been modified as alleged, especially to overcome the admitted deficiencies therein. Nevertheless, even if it were somehow possible (which it isn't) for the references to be combined as alleged, the resultant combination still would not have produced the recited invention of claim 1.

Neither Wagner nor Zeanah, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest programming an automated transaction machine. For an exemplary example, note Specification pages 92-93 and Figures 36-39. Where do the references teach or suggest programming, especially programming an automated transaction machine? Further, where do the references teach or suggest using icons in programming an automated transaction machine?

Nor do Wagner or Zeanah, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest icons that correspond to ATM objects. Where do the references even teach or suggest ATM objects (e.g., Specification page 92)?

Nor do Wagner or Zeanah, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest creating an association between ATM objects, especially by visually representing in a work space an association between icons. Where do the references teach or suggest a method of programming that includes visually representing an association between icons in a work space in order to create an association between ATM objects?

The Office has not established a *prima facie* showing of obviousness. It would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have modified Wagner with the teaching of Zeanah as alleged to have produced the recited method. Thus, Appellants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 40

Nor do Wagner or Zeanah, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the recited features and relationships of claim 40. Neither Wagner or Zeanah, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest programming an operational sequence of ATM functions associated with ATM software objects, including providing a visual pathway between icons in a visual programming environment, where the pathway dictates the sequence of the ATM functions. The Office has not established a *prima facie* showing of obviousness.

Claim 42

Nor do Wagner or Zeanah, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the recited features and relationships of claim 42. Where do the references teach or suggest ATM software

objects that relate to the functionality of an ATM (e.g., Specification pages 92 and 96)? Where do the references teach or suggest having ATM software objects that are each respectively visually represented by a visual icon in a visual programming environment? Where do the references teach or suggest determining an operational sequence of ATM functions by visually linking the icons in the visual programming environment? The Office has not established a *prima facie* showing of obviousness.

The Dependent Claims

Each of the dependent claims depends directly or indirectly from an independent claim. The independent claims have been previously shown to be allowable. Thus, it is asserted that the dependent claims are allowable on the same basis.

Furthermore, each of the dependent claims additionally recites specific features and relationships that patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the applied art. The applied art does not teach the features and relationships that are specifically recited in the dependent claims. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are further allowable due to the recitation of such additional features and relationships. None of the references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features and relationships that are specifically recited in the claims.

Fee For Additional Independent Claims

Please charge the fee associated with the submission of two additional independent claims (\$172) and any other fee due to Deposit Account 09-0428.

Conclusion

Each of Applicants' pending claims specifically recite features and relationships that are neither disclosed nor suggested in any of the applied prior art. Furthermore, the applied prior art is devoid of any such teaching, suggestion, or motivation for combining features of the applied art so as to produce Applicants' recited invention. Allowance of all of Applicants' pending claims is therefore respectfully requested.

The undersigned will be happy to discuss any aspect of the Application by telephone at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Jocke Reg. No. 31,029
WALKER & JOCKE
231 South Broadway
Medina, Ohio 44256
(330) 721-0000

ABSTRACT

A method ~~for visual~~ of visually programming an automated transaction machine (12).

The method includes the creation of terminal directors (225) that generally correspond to transactions performed by the automated transaction machine. The terminal directors are programmed by visually creating associations (238) between a plurality of ATM objects (230, 232) in a work space (224). Exemplary ATM objects include an authorization object (260), a back stage control object (262), a card reader object (264), a customer profile object (266), a depositor object (268), a dispenser object (270), keypad object (272), a logic object (274), a OCS object (276), a presenter object (278), a PIN entry object (280), a printer object (282), a sync object (284), and a transaction data object (286). The customer profile object is operative to retrieve customer profile information responsive to a determined customer of a person using the ATM. ~~A portion of the exemplary ATM objects are operative to interface with a device interface layer (728) for communicating with physical hardware devices (724, 726). The device interface layer is operative to retrieve rules (721) and capability features from a data store (720) for automatically switching between two or more different devices of similar type when one of the devices becomes inoperative.~~